HONORING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE ANN ARBOR NEWS FOR THEIR 174 YEARS OF FINE JOURNALISM

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 2009

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer a tribute in honor of The Ann Arbor News, which has shut its doors after 174 years of service.

Since 1835, the Ann Arbor News and its employees served Washtenaw County creating a forum for educated discussion, thoughtful articles, and current events. I want to thank the employees and journalists of The Ann Arbor News for their fine work, and I wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

The Ann Arbor News lived to see its town of only 1,000 expand to a city of 110,000 and has watched the University of Michigan become one of the finest universities in the world. It predates the Civil War and covered that historic struggle during the 1860s. In the 1950s it covered the announcement of the groundbreaking polio vaccine in Ann Arbor. The News also spread word of two landmark Presidential programs, Kennedy's Peace Corps and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, also unveiled in Ann Arbor. Later on, the News was recognized as one of the best small newspapers in the country out of a field of about 1,350 papers with daily circulations of 50,000 or less (about 85 percent of all daily papers in America).

I am pleased that some of the News' fine journalists will be joining a new venture, AnnArbor.com, which will serve many similar functions as the News, and will guide the Ann Arbor community into the age of digital web information. I would like to offer my tribute to the thousands of people who worked at The Ann Arbor News and established its fine journalistic tradition from 1835 until its close.

EARMARK DECLARATION

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 2009

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the Republican Leadership guidelines on earmarks, I am submitting the following information for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding earmarks I requested that were included as part of H.R. 3293, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010.

Requesting Member: Congressman KEVIN MCCARTHY

Bill Number: H.R. 3293

Account: Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration—Health Facilities and Services

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: San Luis Obispo County Community College District

Address of Requesting Entity: P.O. Box 8106, San Luis Obispo, California 93403

Description of Request: $100,000 was included for the San Luis Obispo County Community College District's (Cuesta College) Department of Nursing & Allied Health SLO & NC to fund upgrades to nursing program training rooms and purchase new medical training equipment to create modern hospital settings for teaching students. Though hospital settings remain the best laboratory for student learning, it is high-risk. This funding will provide Cuesta College nursing students with state-of-the-art, hands-on learning in a low-risk environment, which helps ensure future nurses from Cuesta College have the skills and training to save lives in hospitals and emergency rooms in the region and beyond.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AND REGULATORY ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. SPENCER BACHUS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 2009

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, today the Republican leadership of the House and the Financial Services Committee joined me in introducing H.R. 3310, the Consumer Protection and Regulatory Enhancement Act, to comprehensively modernize and streamline the regulatory structure of the financial services industry.

The legislation will ensure that (1) the government stops rewarding failure and picking winners and losers; (2) taxpayers are never again asked to pick up the tab for bad bets on Wall Street while some creditors and counterparties of failed firms are made whole; and (3) market discipline is restored so that financial firms will no longer expect the government to rescue them from the consequences of imprudent business decisions. The Republican plan seeks to return our regulatory system to one in which government policies do not promote moral hazard, and insolvent financial firms do not become wards of the state.

The Obama administration and many Democrats in Congress have insisted that the financial crisis was caused by a lack of regulation and a failed free market philosophy, requiring government intervention on the scale of the New Deal to "re-regulate" finance. H.R. 3310 is premised upon a belief that it was misguided government policies to allocate credit and government intervention to prop up failed financial institutions that helped precipitate, and later exacerbate, the crisis, which suggests that what is needed is smarter—not more—regulation. The bill fundamentally rejects the command-and-control approach that has characterized the Obama administration's and congressional Democrats' stewardship of the economy.

The Administration's regulatory reform proposals would empower the Federal Reserve as a new "systemic risk super-regulator." Rather than massively expanding the Federal Reserve's mission and further enshrining a failed government policy of rescuing "too big to fail" institutions, H.R. 3310 scales back the Fed's authorities so that it can focus on conducting monetary policy and unwinding the trillions of dollars in obligations it has amassed during the financial crisis. When combined with the administration's reckless "borrow-and-spend" fiscal policy, the vast expansion of the Fed's balance sheet in recent months arguably represents a far more significant source of "systemic risk" to our nation's economy than the failure of any specific financial institution.

The guiding principle of H.R. 3310 can be summed up in one sentence: no more bailouts. By putting an end to ad hoc, improvised and unprincipled bailouts designed to spare big Wall Street firms and their creditors from the consequences of their mistakes, our legislation offers a clear alternative to the limitless and unconstrained "bailout authority" that Democrats want to confer upon those very regulators that failed to anticipate the current crisis that almost wrecked our financial system. The Democrats want to hide the consequences of regulatory and private sector mistakes by giving regulators the authority to bail out large financial institutions, their creditors, and their counterparties, without any accountability whatsoever. Even worse, the Democrats have not yet figured out who is going to pay for this limitless bailout authority, administered by bureaucrats for the benefit of a handful of large financial institutions.

Our legislation also rejects the call for a government-run economy that depends upon the omniscience and omnipotence of government regulators who have shown themselves unable to anticipate crises, let alone do anything to prevent them. Republicans believe that the financial system works best when individual participants are free to keep the gains yielded by their efforts, but are forced to bear the costs of their failure. By adhering to the principle that no firm is "too big to fail," Republicans will ensure that responsibility for monitoring the stability of the financial system is placed exactly where it needs to be: with the individual market participants who have the self-interest and the expertise to monitor their exposure to the financial system, and who are in the best position to take the necessary action to protect themselves, their investors, and their creditors from the risks that are endemic to the financial system.

Rather than asking government to spare participants from the consequences of their mistakes by imposing those costs on others, our legislation calls for the resolution of insolvent non-bank institutions—no matter how large or systemically important—through the bankruptcy system.

The key to making bankruptcy work as an alternative is to make credible and clear the government's commitment to restructuring, reorganizing, or liquidating troubled financial institutions at the expense of their creditors and counterparties. This commitment requires a firm rejection of the current status quo, in which the decision whether to rescue a specific firm and insulate its creditors and counterparties from losses is left to the discretion of regulators accountable to no one but themselves. This commitment also requires the rejection of the possibility of any bailout, no matter how that bailout is described. Without this firm commitment to ending bailouts, too-big-to-fail financial institutions and those who do business with them have every incentive to pursue short term gains, knowing that the costs will ultimately be borne by others if things go wrong. By making credible the government's policy that losses will be borne by those responsible, the government makes the financial system stronger by encouraging creditors to be more vigilant in assessing the creditworthiness and business practices of the parties to whom they are extending credit. And